THE OFFICE OF REGULATORY STAFF SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY AND EXHIBIT

OF

A. Randy Watts



DOCKET NO. 2006-2-E South Carolina Electric and Gas Company Annual Review

(REDACTED)

| 2 | | SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF |
|----------------|----|---|
| 3 | | A. RANDY WATTS |
| 4 5 | | ON BEHALF OF |
| 6 7 | | THE SOUTH CAROLINA OFFICE OF REGULATORY STAFF |
| 8 | | |
| 9 10 | | DOCKET NO. 2006-2-E |
| 11 12 13 | | IN RE: SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY- ANNUAL REVIEW OF BASE RATES FOR FUEL COSTS |
| 14 | Q. | PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS AND |
| 15 | | OCCUPATION. |
| 16 | A. | My name is A. Randy Watts. My business address is 1441 Main Street |
| 17 | | Suite 300, Columbia, South Carolina 29201. I am employed by the State of South |
| 18 | | Carolina as Program Manager in the Electric Department for the Office of |
| 19 | | Regulatory Staff ("ORS"). |
| 20 | Q. | HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS |
| 21 | | PROCEEDING? |
| 22 | A. | Yes. |
| 23 | Q. | WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY? |
| 24 | A. | The purpose of my testimony is to respond to comments of Mr. |
| 25 | | Haimberger made on behalf of South Carolina Electric & Gas Company |
| 26 | | (SCE&G) pertaining to an analysis of off-shore coal purchases included in the |
| 27 | | ORS fuel study ("study") filed on January 31, 2006. In addition, I will respond to |
| 28 | | Mr. Haimberger's remarks on page 5 of his Reply Testimony concerning the |
| 29 | | effect of deferral of fuel cost collections. |

| 1 | Q. | PLEASE ADDRESS MR. HAIMBERGER'S COMMENT THAT THE ORS |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | | FUEL STUDY DID NOT INCLUDE ALL RELEVANT APPLICABLE |
| 3 | | FACTORS IN ITS COMPARISON OF THE VALUE OF COAL |
| 4 | | PURCHASES MADE BY THE COMPANY. |
| 5 | A. | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | Q. | DO YOU AGREE WITH MR. HAIMBERGER'S CONCLUSION THAT |
| 11 | | WITH THE VALUE-ADDED ASSESSMENT THE OFF-SHORE COAL |
| 12 | | PURCHASES WERE FULLY COMPETITIVE WITH DOMESTIC |
| 13 | | PURCHASES? |
| 14 | Α. | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| | | |

| 1 | | |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | Q. | DOES THE INCLUSION OF THESE VALUE-ADDED FACTORS |
| 4 | | AFFECT THE CONCLUSION OR VALIDITY OF THE FUEL STUDY? |
| 5 | A. | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | - | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | Q. | PLEASE ADDRESS MR. HAIMBERGER'S REMARKS CONCERNING |
| 15 | | THE EFFECT OF DEFERRING THE FUEL COST COLLECTIONS. |
| 16 | A. | On page five of his testimony, Mr. Haimberger indicates that if the |
| 17 | | proposed two-year levelization is approved the resulting deferral of fuel costs will |
| 18 | | cause fuel cost recovery factor increases in 2007-2008 in addition to the increases |
| 19 | | anticipated due to coal contract renegotiations. |
| 20 | | Assuming the forecasts are reliable and accurate, and to my knowledge |
| 21 | | they have not been challenged in this proceeding, then the main variable in fuel |
| 22 | | costs for the Company's next annual fuel review in 2007 is the effect of the |
| 23 | | outstanding coal contract renegotiations. Since ORS's proposed factor of 2.516 |

Columbia, SC 29201